

REMARKS

This is a response to the restriction requirement mailed April 13, 2007. Applicant elects with traverse to continue prosecution of the claims directed to Species I, which read on Figs. 4 and 5. The claims that read on this specie are claims 1, 2, 6-18, 21 and 22. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 6-10, 17 and 18 read on Fig. 4 and claims 11-16, 21 and 22 read on Fig. 5.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.143, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction. Section 803 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.) sets out two criteria for proper requirement of restriction: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; *and* (2) there must be a *serious burden* on the Examiner if restriction is required. Applicant does not contest that the first criteria, namely that the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed, is met. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the second criteria specified by M.P.E.P. §803 is not met with regard to Species II and III. Because the inventions defined by various claims within Species I, II and III include a number of common or substantially related elements, in order to properly examine the inventions defined by claims in Species 1, it will likely be necessary for the Examiner to also search art relevant to claims in Species II and III. As such, there will be no significant additional burden imposed by examination of the claims of Species I, II and III together, and the Examiner would not be seriously burdened by examination of the claims of Species I, II and III together.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Santos/
Daniel J. Santos, Reg. No. 40,158

GARDNER GROFF SANTOS & GREENWALD, P.C.
Tel: 770.984.2300
Fax: 770.984.0098